



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/259,427	02/26/1999	MARSHALL A. SLOO	27080	5283

7590 09/10/2003

THOMAS B LUEBBERING
HOVEY WILLIAMS TIMMONS & COLLINS
2405 GRAND BOULEVARD
SUITE 400
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NGA B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3628

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/259,427

Applicant(s)

SLOO, MARSHALL A.

Examiner

Nga B. Nguyen

Art Unit

3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is the answer to the Amendment filed on May 2, 2003, which paper has been placed of record in the file.
2. Claim 1-20 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments/Amendment

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-7 and 9-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan, U.S. Patent No. 5,510,978, in view of Brown, U.S. Patent No. 6,173,284.

Regarding to claim 1, Colgan discloses a computer-based method of collecting and processing incidents observed by witnesses comprising the steps of: receiving into a computer system an incident report directly from a witness who observed an incident; and prompting the witness to provide certain types of information about the incident (column 16, lines 10-25, "UF-61" report).

Colgan does not disclose selecting an authority to whom the incident report should be sent, wherein the authority is selected based at least in part on information provided by the witness and sending the incident report to the selected authority so that the authority can respond to the incident report. However, Brown discloses selecting an authority to whom the incident report should be sent, wherein the authority is selected based at least in part on information provided by the witness and sending the incident report to the selected authority so that the authority can respond to the incident report (column 12, lines 7-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the feature taught by Brown above with Colgan's for the purpose of providing the authority with timely information that can be utilized to solve ongoing crimes.

Regarding to claim 2, Colgan discloses the incident being selected from the group consisting of a criminal act, a legal violation, a sale of a defective product, and a rendering of an unsatisfactory service (column 16, lines 25-37).

Regarding to claim 3, Colgan discloses prompting the witness to enter into the incident report identification information identifying the offender (column 17, lines 23-30).

Regarding to claims 4-6, Colgan does not disclose receiving additional identification information identifying the offender and adding the additional identification information to the incident report; the additional information being obtained by searching files accessible by the computer system or receiving from the authority based on the identification information entered by the witness. However, it is well known in the art to receive additional information about the offender by searching the computer system or receiving from the authority. For example, a police officer can obtain more information about the offender by searching the computer database or receives from the other

resource such as individuals, groups of influence in the community or organizations, etc.... Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature above in Colgan's for the purpose of providing more information about the offender in order to solve ongoing crimes.

Regarding to claim 7, Brown discloses the authority is automatically selected by the computer system based on information entered into the incident report by the witness (column 7, lines 30-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature above in Colgan's for the purpose of time consuming for the authority.

Regarding to claims 9-10, Colgan discloses receiving into the computer system an action report from the authority explaining the action the authority took in response to the incident report and storing the action report along with the incident report in a file accessible by the computer system (column 17, lines 31-50).

Regarding to claim 11, Colgan discloses incident reports from a plurality of different witnesses are received in the computer system (column 17, lines 50-62).

Regarding to claims 12-14, Colgan discloses storing the incident reports in a searchable database, permitting persons to access the searchable database to view the incident reports (column 16, lines 25-55), and receiving additional incident information from the persons that access the searchable database and adding the additional incident information to the incident reports to assist the authorities to solve crimes (column 17, lines 9-22).

Regarding to claims 15-16, Colgan does not disclose sending the additional identification information to the witness and prompting the witness to update the incident report based on the additional identification information. However, sending the information and updating information are well known. For example, conventional

Art Unit: 3628

electronic message allows people to send and receive messages over the computer network. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Colgan's to include the feature above for the purpose of allowing the witness to receive and update information in order to assist the authority to solve crimes.

Claims 17-20 contain the same limitations found in claims (1, 3), 7, 9, (1, 3, 7, 9, 12), respectively, therefore are rejected by the same rationale.

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan, U.S. Patent No. 5,510,978, in view of Brown, U.S. Patent No. 6,173,284, and further in view of Becker et al (hereinafter Becker), U.S. Patent No. 5,983,238.

Regarding to claim 8, Colgan and Brown do not disclose the authority is selected by the witness. However, Becker discloses the authority is selected by the witness (column 8, line 57-column 9, line 21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Colgan's to include the feature above for the purpose of providing the witness the choice to select the authority to report the incident.

Conclusion

7. Claims **1-20** are rejected.

8. The prior arts made of record and not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Jacobs et al. (US 5,185,697) discloses a crisis management system for receiving information from various sources, updating automatically all related files, to assist authorities during a crisis.

Giovannoli (US 5,758,328) discloses a computerized system for forming a computer based communications network of network members inclusive of network buyers and vendors in which, the buyer generates a request for quotation of goods, the system automatically selects the vendor to send the quotation based on the condition defined by the buyer.

Hanrahan (FBI Law Enforcement Bulleting) discloses an electronic bulletin board allows the witness to submit online police reports.

Mannix (US News & World Report) discloses the Web site allows public to report incidents of fraud.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Nga B. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-2901. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9:00AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung S. Sough can be reached on (703) 308-0505.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-1113.

10. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
C/o Technology Center 3600
Washington, DC 20231

Or faxed to:

Application/Control Number: 09/259,427
Art Unit: 3628

Page 7

(703) 872-9326 (for formal communication intended for entry),

or

(703) 308-3691 (for informal or draft communication, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal
Drive, Arlington, VA, Seventh Floor (Receptionist).

Nga B. Nguyen



September 5, 2003